

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/671,308	09/25/2003	Takuya Konno	EL0505 US NA	8017	
23906	7590 09/27/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER			KOPEC, MARK T		
	LL PLAZA 25/1128		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
4417 LANCASTER PIKE			1751		
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19805		DATE MAILED, 00/27/2004	-	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commons	10/671,308	KONNO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
TI MAIL DIO DATE (Mark Kopec	1751					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	nears on the cover sneet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MAILING TH	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
•							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5-7</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· _	6) Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.						
· ·	7) Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
o) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers	•						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	*	• •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	diffilier. Note the attached Office	Action of format 10-102.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 							
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
•							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· +F					

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a conductive paste, classified in class 252, subclass 512.
- II. Claims 5-7, drawn to a multilayer capacitor/method making, classified in class 427, subclass 62+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a conductive trace or chip adhesive and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior

art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and their different classification, and because the searches required for the distinct groups are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Barbara Siegell on 9/19/05 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-4. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 5-7 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/671,308 Page 4

Art Unit: 1751

Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 4 has not been further treated on the merits.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere*Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2002-80675.

Note that a full English language translation of this reference has been ordered and will be provided to applicant as soon as possible.

JP 2002-80675 discloses an acrylic binder resin composition for a baking-type paste which can impart high viscosity to the paste by the use of a small amount and exhibits excellent

properties in baking. This binder resin composition is a solution comprising (A) 100 pts.mass thermoplastic acrylic polymer having a wt. average mol.wt. of 1,000,000-6,000,000 and (B) 400-1,900 pts. (mass) organic solvent containing at least 50 mass% aromatic alcohol having a boiling point of 200°C or higher and has a Brookfield viscosity (at 25°C) of 10,000 mPa.s or higher (Abstract). A "spot translation" discloses that the reference teaches "various types of fillers such as oxide compounds including alumina, zirconia, titanium oxide and barium titanate, nitride compounds including alumina nitride, silicon nitride and boron nitride, metals including copper, silver and nickel, silica powders including a low melting point glass powder and as various types of fluorescence used for a cathode beam and a PDP." (para 0029). Additionally, The invention uses an acrylic binder resin composition. (para 005). The reference specifically or inherently meets each of the claimed limitations.

The reference is anticipatory.

In the event that any minor modifications are necessary to meet the claimed limitations, such as minor variation in percentages of binder/inorganic powder, such modifications are well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

The remaining references listed on forms 892 and 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is (571) 272-1319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,308 Page 8

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Kopec
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

MK September 22, 2005